

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
NORTHERN DIVISION

DAVID GOWARD,

Petitioner,

v.

Criminal Case Number 02-20043

Civil Case Number 10-11004

Honorable David M. Lawson

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondent.

ORDER DENYING CERTIFICATE OF APPEALABILITY

The petitioner filed a motion under 28 U.S.C. § 2255 on December 1, 2010. On October 31, 2012, the Court entered an opinion and order determining that the petitioner was not denied the effective assistance of counsel and that the remainder of the petitioner's claims should have been brought on direct appeal and were not reviewable in a section 2255 motion. On this basis, the Court entered judgment against the petitioner.

Pursuant to Rule 11 of the Rules Governing Section 2255 Proceedings, which was amended as of December 1, 2009:

The district court must issue or deny a certificate of appealability when it enters a final order adverse to the applicant. . . . If the court issues a certificate, the court must state the specific issue or issues that satisfy the showing required by 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). If the court denies a certificate, a party may not appeal the denial but may seek a certificate from the court of appeals under Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 22.

Rule 11, Rules Governing Section 2255 Proceedings.

A certificate of appealability may issue “only if the applicant has made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right.” 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). Courts must either issue a certificate of appealability indicating which issues satisfy the required showing or provide reasons why such

a certificate should not issue. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(3); Fed. R. App. P. 22(b); *In re Certificates of Appealability*, 106 F.3d 1306, 1307 (6th Cir. 1997). To receive a certificate of appealability, “a petitioner must show that reasonable jurists could debate whether (or, for that matter, agree that) the petition should have been resolved in a different manner or that the issues presented were adequate to deserve encouragement to proceed further.” *Miller-El v. Cockrell*, 537 U.S. 322, 336 (2003) (internal quotes and citations omitted).

The Court finds that reasonable jurists could not debate whether the petitioner was denied the effective assistance of counsel or whether the petitioner’s other claims are not reviewable in a 2255 motion. Therefore, the Court will deny a certificate of appealability.

Accordingly, it is **ORDERED** that a certificate of appealability is **DENIED**.

s/David M. Lawson
DAVID M. LAWSON
United States District Judge

Dated: November 1, 2012

PROOF OF SERVICE

The undersigned certifies that a copy of the foregoing order was served upon each attorney or party of record herein by electronic means or first class U.S. mail on November 1, 2012.

s/Deborah R. Tofil
DEBORAH R. TOFIL